

Responses to Questions Submitted for RFP 13-62

QUESTION	ANSWER
<p>The purpose of the RFP on page 3 states, "The purpose of this RFP is to select a vendor that can satisfy the State's need for assistance in the development and implementation of a quality assurance program that provides quality audit reviews." Is there a vendor currently providing these services? If so, please provide the vendor name, contract number, and staffing plan utilized.</p>	<p>The current vendor is HP Enterprise Services. The current contract is A55-9-99-09-WA-2559. It is expected that respondents provide a staffing plan based on the scope of work in this RFP.</p>
<p>Can the State provide a complete copy of the Scope of Work. What is currently provided is 1.4 Summary Scope of Work.</p>	<p>The complete Scope of Work will be determined when a vendor is selected and the contract is negotiated. Respondents can review the current contract, but please be advised that it is not guaranteed that a new scope of work will be the same.</p>
<p>The purpose of the RFP on page 3 states, "The purpose of this RFP is to select a vendor that can satisfy the State's need for assistance in the development and implementation of a quality assurance program that provides quality audit reviews." Will the successful vendor be required to develop the tools and processes needed to carry out the Scope of Work? If these tools have already been developed, will the successful vendor be allowed to use them under a new contract?</p>	<p>Each year, existing tools are reviewed/revised and new tools are created according to the Scope of Work and needs of DMHA. The State intends to contract with a vendor that is familiar with DMHA rules/regulations and certification requirements and has the experience and capacity to use proven methodologies to create tools as needed.</p>
<p>Would it be possible for the State to provide sample audit tools for each Provider Type (Section 1.4) included in the audit process?</p>	<p>DMHA certification, contract and policy requirements will provide the framework for reviews. It is DMHA's expectation that the vendor will bring to the table relevant experience and utilization of proven tools and methodologies within their industry. DMHA also expects that the vendor will develop any forms/templates needed to assist with reviews.</p>
<p>If available, please provide the tools and processes currently utilized to conduct these reviews.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, the RFP states, "The selected respondent is expected to update, edit, and/or create any needed forms/templates to assist with reviews, as well as, offer recommendations on addressing any noncompliance issues found during audits." Can the State provide copies of the current forms/templates that are being used?</p>	<p>See above.</p>

<p>Page 3 of the RFP states, "The selected respondent is expected to update, edit, and/or create any needed forms/templates to assist with reviews, as well as, offer recommendations on addressing any noncompliance issues found during audits." Can the State provide information about what software packages (e.g., MS Word, MS Excel, MS Access) the current templates have been developed in?</p>	<p>This may vary by form. There is not a specific software package the State expects the vendor to use.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Scope of Work states "...responsible for 85 on-site audits, follow-ups, and/or outlier reviews each fiscal year...." However in the Technical Proposal, items 2.4.5. and 2.4.6. the respondent is asked about the number of reviews "to be completed each fiscal year by provider type". Please explain the apparent discrepancy.</p>	<p>The vendor will be responsible for up to 85 on-site audits, as stated in the Scope of Work. The items in the Technical Proposal are asking respondents to provide a proposed schedule and timeline that demonstrates vendor's ability to complete all needed reviews.</p>
<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, it states that the selected respondent will be responsible for a minimum of 85 on-site audits, follow-ups, and/or outlier reviews each fiscal year. Is there an anticipated maximum number of reviews that can be shared?</p>	<p>There is not a maximum. 85 is the anticipated number of audits to be completed in the fiscal year; however, there may be additional audits - if the vendor and DMHA agree - added as needed.</p>
<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, the provided table includes the average time needed on-site to complete each provider review type. Is this the average amount of time it would take one reviewer on-site to complete the review? Is it anticipated that more than one reviewer will participate in each type of provider audit? If so, can the State provide the anticipated number of reviewers they expect would be required to complete the on-site portion of the review within the average time needed (days provided in the table by review)? It would be helpful if this information could be provided by provider audit type.</p>	<p>The stated times are estimated based on previous experience and include only time spent on-site. It is up to the vendor to determine the number of staff needed to complete audits in a timely manner (within the time frames listed) and to subsequently complete the required reports.</p>
<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, the RFP states that the review team will conduct interviews of staff and patients. Is there an expected minimum number of interviews (both staff and patients) that the State expects to occur for each review? Can these interviews be conducted over the phone?</p>	<p>There is no minimum expectation and they may not be conducted by phone.</p>

<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, it states that the selected respondent will be responsible for a minimum of 85 on-site audits, follow-ups, and/or outlier reviews each fiscal year. In the provided table, the minimum number of provider reviews is also included. Can the State provide the exact number of reviews for each of these categories that were conducted during the current fiscal year (including those that are anticipated to be completed by the end of the fiscal year)?</p>	<p>The actual amount of reviews completed this fiscal year is still under review. We do not have a final number available.</p>
<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, the provided table includes a minimum number of 10 follow-up audits. Is it the State's expectation that follow-up reviews will focus on identified deficiencies and implementation of a providers corrective action plan, or are these reviews more complete (i.e., similar to the initial review - covering all areas noted as deficient or not)?</p>	<p>Historically, follow-up reviews focus on identified deficiencies, plans of correction, and/or DMHA areas of concern - and so usually follow the initial review and are not as extensive as the initial review.</p>
<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, the provided table includes a minimum number of 10 follow-up audits. Are follow-up reviews currently conducted for all provider audits with any number of identified provider deficiencies (i.e., negative findings)?</p>	<p>Follow-up audits are identified by DMHA and may be based on many factors, not necessarily a specific number of deficiencies.</p>
<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, the provided table includes a minimum number of 10 follow-up audits. Is it the State's expectation that follow-up reviews will include interviews of employees and patients? If so, does the State have an expectation of the number of interviews that will be completed as part of the follow-up process?</p>	<p>There is not an expectation that follow-ups will include interviews.</p>
<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 3, the RFP states, "Follow-up and outlier audits may occur on an as-needed basis as determined by DMHA when a provider is non-compliant with state requirements or has audit scores outside the normal range of provider scores." Can the State provide information about how the normal range of provider scores is currently determined, as well as the process that is used to determine if a provider's score is outside of this range? Are there separate ranges for each type of provider audit?</p>	<p>The current vendor uses a formula to determine scores and score ranges. The vendor will be responsible for determining the average range of scores and scores that would be considered outliers based on their data analysis.</p>

Can the State provide the locations of all known reviews?	DMHA will not be listing all specific sites at this time as sites of service may change - the vendor will be expected to conduct audits across the state. More information about the range of providers DMHA licenses/certifies and locations can be found at www.in.gov/fssa/dmha
Within the Summary Scope of Work section of this RFP on page 3, it includes reference to, "The respondent will also be responsible for maintaining adequate supporting documentation for each audit." Does DMHA currently maintain a database that they utilize to capture the results of audits? If so, does this database allow for documents to be uploaded for retention? Can the State provide information about the database such as the platform, where it is housed, and who has access to it?	The State will work with the vendor to determine the best way to retain results and documentation, in a manner that is secure and compliant with privacy regulations. It is expected that only those who require direct access to the information will have that access.
Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 4, there is reference to staff maintaining relevant clinical licensure and/or credentialing from a DMHA credentialing body. Is it the State's expectation that all reviewers meet these licensure and/or credentialing requirements? Can the non-clinician portion of the reviews be completed by non-licensed and/or credentialed staff?	Any staff completing audits on-site must meet license/credential requirements.
Please confirm response at 5/9/13 pre-proposal conference that IN licensure for those performing clinical portions of the review is "preferred" and not "required."	Any staff completing audits on-site must meet license/credential requirements.
Please provide the clinical affiliation of the staff currently conducting the surveys (i.e., RN's, LCSW's)	All staff currently conducting audits meet the license/credential requirements set forth in the contract.
Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 4, the RFP states, "All on-site reviewers must complete CANS/ANSA Super User Training and all QA staff members must attend periodic trainings as requested by DMHA." If a new vendor is selected for this contract, when does the State anticipate this training could be made available to reviewers? If there is a cost for this training, can the State provide information about that cost? How long will this training take and where would the location of the training be?	Vendors would be expected to attend CANS/ANSA training as quickly as possible. There is no cost for the training and it takes place at the Indiana Government Center in Indianapolis. More information about CANS/ANSA SuperUser Training can be found: https://dmha.fssa.in.gov/DARMHA/mainNews.aspx

<p>Within the Summary Scope of Work section on page 4, the RFP states, "All on-site reviewers must complete CANS/ANSA Super User Training and all QA staff members must attend periodic trainings as requested by DMHA." What are the anticipated number of trainings that would occur throughout the year? Also, can the State provide information about the location that these trainings will take place?</p>	<p>The State anticipates a minimum of 4 additional trainings throughout the year. Generally, these will occur at the Indiana Government Center in Indianapolis.</p>
<p>Within the Technical Proposal Template (Attachment F), the State is requesting information about the proposed QA team members, including names, background information, and services each individual will perform for the State. Is it the State's expectation that the vendor would provide the actual names of the staff that they are proposing to be part of this contract? In lieu of current staff, would the State accept titles, proposed background and services to be provided?</p>	<p>If the vendor has a specific team in place that they know would be conducting the audits, the State does ask to see the requested information for each team member. If the vendor does not have a specific team in place, titles/roles, and proposed backgrounds are acceptable.</p>
<p>Within the Technical Proposal Template (Attachment F), the State is requesting resumes and credentials for each individual on the proposed team. In lieu of current staff, would the State accept representative resumes of Vendor staff providing similar services for FSSA or working in similar quality programs in other states?</p>	<p>If the vendor has a specific team in place that they know would be conducting the audits, the State does ask to see the requested information for each team member. If the vendor does not have a specific team in place, titles/roles, and proposed backgrounds are acceptable, these can be based on similar quality programs, but it is not necessary to provide specific information about individuals that will not be part of the QA team.</p>
<p>Within the Type and Term of Contract section on page 7, the RFP states, "The State intends to sign a contract with one or more Respondent(s) to fulfill the requirements in this RFP. Will the State allow multiple vendors to fulfill the requirements in this RFP, or will the State sign one vendor for this purpose?"</p>	<p>It is the State's intention with this contract with one vendor.</p>
<p>Within the table captured in the Summary of Milestones section of this RFP, there are a number of dates To Be Determined (TBD). Can the State provide information about the expiration date of the current vendor's contract, if any?</p>	<p>6/30/2013</p>

<p>Within the table captured in the Summary of Milestones section of this RFP, there are a number of dates To Be Determined (TBD). If a new vendor is selected, is there an expected date that the State would anticipate the new vendor would be ready to conduct the reviews outlined in the RFP? If a new vendor is selected, will the State allow for a transition period?</p>	<p>The State cannot give a specific date that a new vendor would be ready to conduct reviews. There is not an anticipated "transition" period, but there would be a period of contract negotiation and start-up with a new vendor. It is the State's hope to keep that process as short as possible, while still enabling both the State and vendor time to agree on contract terms and program details.</p>
<p>In Addendum I, the approximate amount spent annually was updated. "Over the past four (4) years, the State has on average spent approximately \$700,000 annually on Assurance Auditing and Reporting Services." Within this number (i.e., average spent), does this number include reviews of Transitional Residential Services? There is some question whether these are included within the current vendor's scope.</p>	<p>The scope of work has changed over the last four years and been adjusted annually according to DMHA needs. This is an average and the actual amount spent each year, and in the new contract will be based on the scope of work. Transitional Residential Services have been reviewed by the current vendor.</p>
<p>Please confirm travel expenses should be captured in the overhead percentage column for each position.</p>	<p>Travel expenses, along with any other reoccurring rates associated with the performance of the scope of work should be captured in the overhead cost portion of each staff position.</p>
<p>Please confirm whether or not the vendor must use the state employee travel reimbursement rates on this contract and whether or not vendors will be able to utilize the state rate at hotels under existing agreements.</p>	<p>Respondents should include all anticipated travel expenditures as overhead in the Cost Proposal. Respondents are not restricted to offer any particular rate, but should consider rates that are realistic and economically viable to their proposals. The contracted vendor will not have access to state travel agreement rates.</p>
<p>Could you please supply a listing of the current state rates of reimbursement for travel expenses such as mileage, hotel, and food per diems?</p>	<p>Although it is not germane to this solicitation, the following link will travel information for State employees. http://www.in.gov/idoa/2459.htm</p>
<p>"The proposals that meet the Mandatory Requirements will then be scored based on Criteria 2 and 3 ONLY. This scoring will have a maximum possible score of 55 points with a potential of 5 bonus points if certain criteria are met." Will (can) the state provide the criteria for the referenced 5 bonus points available in Step 2 of the evaluation criteria?</p>	<p>Language referencing 5 bonus points was mistakenly included in this section. The total number of points available for criteria 2 and 3 is 50.</p>

Is it expected that the Overhead Rate in the Cost Proposal form would include fringe benefits as well as overhead? Are there any expectations (limits for example) on the rate that would be priced in the Cost Proposal?	Responses will be evaluated based on the total bid amount submitted. Likewise, the Respondent's total bid about will be used for any subsequent contract agreement. How Respondents decide to account for items such as fringe benefits is their discretion. They can be included by increasing overhead or hourly rates.
Within the General section of this RFP on page 10, it includes, "To facilitate the timely evaluation of proposals, a standard format for proposal submission has been developed and is described in this section." Can the State provide an "unlocked" version of the template to allow for further manipulation of the structure?	Yes, an unlocked version will be provided under the same link.
Within the Cost Proposal Template (Attachment D), the Number of Hours Required per Position by Facility Inspection Type are provided. Does this include only time that is associated with the on-site review? Does this time include travel time?	Respondents can use their own discretion to account for travel expenses by manipulating the hours or the rates (or both).
The Revised Cost Proposal Template (Attachment D) includes the minimum number of inspections by facility type. These numbers are different from table provided in 1.4 Summary Scope of Work (Transitional Residential Services, Follow-Ups and Outliers). Please specify which numbers are correct.	The Summary Scope of Work is correct; please adjust the boxes on the Cost Proposal Template accordingly.
Within the General section of this RFP on page 10, it includes, "To facilitate the timely evaluation of proposals, a standard format for proposal submission has been developed and is described in this section." The current Excel template used for the proposal sections (e.g., technical, business) can pose a challenge when including sufficient responses to the questions noted. Is use of the posted templates considered part of the, "Adherence to Mandatory Requirements" or is there an option to utilize a different format/software when submitting a proposal (e.g. Microsoft Word)?	An unlocked version of this file will be provided under the same link; although Respondents will not be disqualified for changing these documents, reasonable care should be taken to keep the document close to the original format.
Full Time (FTE) Equivalent Definition: Does the State expect each FTE to work 52 weeks per year or will there be an allowance for Paid Time Off (i.e., sick holiday, vacation time)?	The State allows for the paid time off items in question.